

**REMARKS**

The examiner has requested an election / restriction to either Group I for a method or Group II for a device. Applicant elects Group I for the method, which corresponds to Claims 1-4, 6, 12, and 14. This election is made without traverse.


The examiner's Office Action of 16 October 2007 did not taken into account the Preliminary Amendment of 31 August 2006, which removed the multiple dependencies of Claims 6 and 11 and added new claims 12-17. However, during a telephone conference with Examiner Chimiak on 7 December 2007, the examiner indicated that Applicant could disregard the portion of the Office Action regarding the multiple dependencies of Claims 6 and 11 but that the election / restriction requirement stood. As new Claims 12 and 14 are directed to the method, Applicant assumes that these claims are included in Group I and requests that they also be examined. As such, Applicant believes Claims 1-4, 6, 12, and 14 are in Group I, the elected group, and restricts this patent application to those claims. Claims 5, 7-11, 13, and 15-17 have been withdrawn.

Claim 14 has been amended to depend from Claim 12 rather than withdrawn  
Claim 13. no new matter has been added.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants submit that the patent application is in condition for examination and allowance and respectfully request such actions. If the examiner has any questions that can be answered by telephone, please contact the patent attorney of record at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Laurence P. Colton  
USPTO Reg. No. 33,371

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP  
1230 Peachtree Street NW, Suite 3100  
Atlanta GA 30309

Tel: 404.815.3681  
Fax: 404.685.6981  
E-Mail: lcolton@sgrlaw.com